Kopp, Botho von

Japanese professors and their university: Teaching and research in a changing context. Report on a survey in Japanese colleges and universities

Frankfurt am Main : Deutsches Institut für Internationale Pädagogische Forschung 1993, 52, 14 S.

Japanese Professors and Their University: Teaching and Research in a Changing Context

Report on a survey in Japanese colleges and universities

Botho von Kopp

Frankfurt am Main 1993

Table of contents

I. Introductory remarks

The survey of which the basic outcomes are presented here, was conducted in Japan between September and November 1991 in co-operation with Takekazu Ehara, professor of Kyoto University, department of education. I stayed in Japan as a guest-researcher of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, invited by Mr. Ehara. During my stay in Japan I conducted intensive interviews at 15 universities and three research institutes, prepared a questionnaire, and sent it to 169 professors, assistant professors and lecturers at various universities.

The basic design of the survey was to find out about the attitudes of Japanese higher education teachers (professors, assistant professors and lecturers) towards their material and non-material work conditions and about their views on some acute problems and strategies in the face of present changes. Despite a high return rate of 64 per cent, the figure of the sample is, of course, too small to be a representative survey in a strict sense, rather it has the character of a pilot study. However, I included in my survey various departments ranging from literature to technology (but excluding medical schools) and higher education institutions of different types, metropolitan and local, private, national and other public as well as junior colleges (tanki daigaku). A larger part of the questionnaires (28%) was distributed inside Kyoto University; so this type of a prestigious (formerly "imperial") national university is somewhat over represented, on the other hand it was thus possible to contrast this type with the higher education sector as a whole.

As for the general context of the questionnaire I received some inspiration from a project that was initially undertaken by Manuel Crespo, professor at Montreal University. He examined the effects of austerity policy on Canada's universities in the early eighties and he became interested in comparing this question with some more countries[1]. He initiated and supervised a follow-up research in which a survey was undertaken in France and in Germany.[2] The project was for the largest part financed by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and, as far as the German survey is concerned, also partly by the Deutsches Institut für Internationale Pädagogische Forschung (DIPF). The German part (adoption of the questionnaire, interviews, pre-tests and conducting the survey and publishing a final report) was done by me and my colleague at the DIPF, Dr. Manfred Weiß. Both, analysis and comparison of the French and the German surveys are planed to be published in a book. Although my Japanese survey is distinct in some parts and above all in size - the German questionnaire was send to more than 2.500 professors, the French one to more than 5.000 professors (with a return rate of some 22% in both cases) -- the general aim and the global structuring in 4 main sections dealing with basic information on the sample, work conditions, work satisfaction and further prospects, are the same. In the following presentation I restrict myself

---

[1] Manuel Crespo: The Management of Austerity in Higher Education: An International parison. In: Higher Education, 1989, p. 373-395.

[2] Botho von Kopp, Manfred Weiß: Der "Arbeitsplatz Universität" und die Zukunft der Hochschulen aus der Sicht von Hochschullehrern. Eine Internationale Vergleichsuntersuchung. Erster Ergebnisbericht. Frankfurt: Deutsches Institut für Internationale Pädagogische Forschung 1993, and:
Marie-Françoise Fave-Bonnet: L´opinion des enseignants-chercheurs sur les évolutions actuelles de l´Université. In: Savoir, 1992, No. 1 (Jan.-March), p. 9 - 18 and Ibid. 1992, No. 2 (April-June), p. 161 - 170.

to the description of the Japanese project, in the summary however, I should like to mention some similar outcomes from the Japanese and the German surveys.
I take here the opportunity to thank especially Mr. Takekazu Ehara, because without his competence, understanding and help this project could have never been realised. I also thank all those who kindly devoted their time for my interviews and, in addition consented to hand over questionnaires to colleagues at their university and all those who answered the questionnaire and last but not least Mr. Atsuo Fujimto who translated my draft questionnaire into Japanese. I also should like to thank Mrs. Hatsuyo Nambu who helped to copy and to mail the questionnaires and Mrs. Natasa von Kopp who assisted me by making a first evaluation of the outcomes that became the basis for a conference presentation and an article[3]. I am further grateful to the staff of the DIPF's statistics division, namely Mr. A. Rieder, who supervised and Mr. R. Ciompa and Mr. W. Zinsmeister who carried out the computing as well as Mrs. I. Firlus and Mrs. J. Neumann who typed the data into the computer – which all was certainly not facilitated by the fact that the questionnaire was in Japanese.

[3] Botho von Kopp: The japanese university in a changing context: more market or more regulation?. Presented at the VIII World Congress of Comparative Education Prague, July 1992 and published in: W. Wolfgang Mitter, Ulrich Schäfer (eds.): Bildung und Erziehung im Umbruch/Upheavel and Change in Education. Frankfurt, 1993, S. 85-98.

II. Basic information on the survey and the sample

II.I.
The questionnaire was send to 169 persons (among those: 48 in Kyoto University - Kyodai and 41 to members of an academic – Society for Democratic Education and the rest of 80 questionnaires was send to 14 persons I had interviewed before and had asked to distribute the questionnaire to some colleagues at their universities). The return-rate is 62,72% = 106 questionnaires (25 from Kyoto University).

II.II.
Questions and answers relate to the time span of academic year 1990/91

II.III
If not mentioned otherwise, all percentages refer to the sum of persons who answered the corresponding question ("valid cases").

II.IV.
I use the term "professors" in the sense of regular academic teaching staff (that is excluding external and part-time staff) in different types of Japanese higher educational institutions: university (daigaku) and junior college (tanki daigaku). In case that I want to distinguish between the categories of teachers, I refer to "full professors" (kyouju), "assistant professors" (jokyouju) and "lecturers" (koushi)

II.V.
In Japan the organizational subdivision of higher education institutions is diversified in structure and in terminology. In most cases there are in universities "gakubu" which in the British system would be "college" and in the American system "department", in Germany is "faculty" or corresponds in the new system to "Fachbereich". However, I am not sure about the next lower levels and propose to translate "kenkyuushitsu" as "institute".

II.VI.
The total distribution of all three categories of higher education teachers of the sample was: full professors: 57,3%, assistant professors 32% and lecturers 10,7%.

II.VII.
There is a great variety of institutions if one distinguishes between junior colleges and universities, public and private and if one takes into consideration the owner of public institutions (local, prefectural, national authorities). Since the overall sample was too small in order to make sensible distinctions between all these categories, the main distinctions I refer to, usually are between national and private universities. In case it might make sense to contrast the whole public with the whole private sector. Also I occasionally make a distinction between "full" private universities, that is such, offering graduate studies, either only "master courses" or both, "master" and "doctor courses" (all national universities offer graduate studies) and universities without graduate studies. If not otherwise mentioned and specified, I speak in this study of "universities" meaning all types of 4-year institutions (daigaku) on the one hand and junior colleges (tanki daigagku) on the other hand. To both I refer to as "higher educational institutions" respectively "institutions". Since the number of respondents from junior colleges is low in

my sample, I could not treat this group distinctly. Junior colleges are called "tanki daigaku" in Japanese, which literally means "little university", but these institutions are not universities in a strict sense. Originally they offered a great variety of courses and attracted about the half of their students among men. This has changed dramatically and presently junior colleges attract young woman: between 1955 and 1991 the share of female students in junior colleges increased from 54% to 91,6%.
Since a significant part of the sample (23,6%) was professors of Kyoto University (which stands for the type of a highly prestigious national university), I occasionally refer especially to that institution.

III. Outcomes of the survey

1 Questions on personal data in the context of the present (former) university

1.1 Basic data

1.1.1: Age

The average age of the respondents was 50 years. The range of age was between 31 and 71 years. The distribution was quite regular having 35 single age positions in the cited range, 20,9% of the total were up to 40 years old, 47,6% were up to 50 years old 31% were between 50 and 60 years old, only 9% were older than 60 years.

1.1.2: Sex

Table 1.1: Sex of the sample (percentage)

male	94,3
female	5,7

1.1.3: Present position (full professor, assistant professor, lecturer)

Table 1.2: Position of the sample (percentage)

full professors	57,3%
assistant professors	32%
lecturers	11,8%

*Table 1.3: Position and sex of the sample**

→ position ↓	full professors (kyoju)	assistant professors (jokyoju)	lecturers (koshi)
male	56	32	11
female	3	1	2

* 2 frequency missing

In fact the actual distribution of academic and teacher positions in the Japanese higher education system is similar: Full professors come up to 48,3%, assistant professors to 32,1% and lecturers to 19,6%, that is, full professors are somewhat over represented, and on the other hand lecturers are somewhat underrepresented As could be expected, the figure of women is very low (6 that is 5,8% of the total sample), three of them are full professors (5,1% of all full professors). This is fairly similar to the share of female

full professors in Japanese universities (5,0%). However, the total share of woman teachers of all three categories together – full professors, assistant professors and lecturers – in Japanese higher education as a whole is 11,9% (7,22% in the university sector and as much as 34,5% in the junior college sector).

Table 1.4: Position and sex in the higher educational system: universities only (1990)

➔ position	full professor (kyoju)	assistant professor (jokyoju)	lecturer (koshi)
total	49,1%	32,0%	18,2%
female	5,0%	8,04%	11,8%

source: mombu sokei yoran, heisei 3 nen, p.84-85

*Table 1.5: Position and sex in the higher educational system: universities and junior colleges together (1990)**

➔ position	full professor (kyoju)	assistant professor (jokyoju)	lecturer (koshi)
total	48,3%	32,1%	19,6%
female	8,0%	13,0%	19,5%

source: mombu sokei yoran, heisei 3 nen, p.84-85
* excluding part-time and external teachers

1.1.4: Type of university (national, local, private, public)

*Table 1.6: Types of institutions of the sample.**

➔ type of institution	frequency of respondents
national universities	60
private universities:	
- with graduate schools	24
- without graduate schools	8
private junior colleges	8
Prefectural universities:	
- with graduate schools	3
- without graduate schools	1
Prefectural junior colleges	1

frequency missing:1

57,1% of the respondents are employed at national universities, 30,5% are from private universities (22,8% from "full universities" offering graduate studies in master and doctoral courses, 7,6% from private universities without such graduate courses); the rest is from other institutions listed in table 1.6.

As for the types of institutions, teachers from national universities are somewhat over represented in my study, where they come up to 57,1%. In reality only 34,9% of all professors are employed at national universities (but 40,8% in the university sector alone against only 5,6% of all junior college teachers). Still, a much sharper contrast is to be found if one compares the figures of institutions instead of the number of employed: only 19,4% of all higher educational institutions are national universities. The disparities show by the way, that the national universities are much better equipped with highly qualified
categories in my sample are teachers from private universities, followed by some teachers from private junior colleges, and, less numerous, from prefectural Universities and from one prefectural junior college.

Table 1.7: Types of higher education institutions. Differences in the numbers of institutions, students and teachers (1988)

a) Distribution: Institutions

	universities	junior colleges
national	19,4%	7,0%
private	72,9%	83,5%
local*	7,8%	9,5%

b) Distribution: Students

	universities	junior colleges
national	24,6%	4,2%
private	72,4%	90,9%
local*	3,0%	4,9%

c) Distribution: Faculty members

	universities	junior colleges
national	44,5%	6,5%
private	50,2%	83,2%
local*	5,3%	10,3%

Mombusho: education in Japan 1989, p. 22
* local and prefectural

As was mentioned already, the national universities are strongly over represented in my sample. Though, the comparison between the tables 1.7.a) - c) shows that breaking down the university sector in terms of institutions, national universities make only 19,4% of the whole, but in terms of the university teachers the share of the national sector is 44,5%.

cross calculation: position by type of higher educational institution:
The majority of the full professors (50,8%) of the sample is employed in the national universities, the second largest number is employed in the private universities: 28,81%; More than two thirds of the assistant professors comes from the national universities (75,75%), most lecturers (60%) from private colleges and universities.

1.2 Career mobility

It is common knowledge that mobility in the Japanese higher education system is low. Changing the institution is restricted and unusual as far as the level of undergraduate studies is concerned, but it is also not very common among students in master or doctorate courses to change the university. As far as the university teachers are concerned, not much respective data seems to be available, but the hypotheses to this question were that mobility would be rather low. The outcomes do not support this interpretation necessarily, they should, however, be compared with other surveys and with corresponding international figures: 3,9% of the respondents remained at the same university they studied at, 52,4% of the respondents have worked (including the present university) at 2 universities, 29,1% have worked in 3 institutions and the rest in 4 to 7 institutions.

1.3 Additional activities

The questionnaire also asked, if the respondents had ever done (or are doing at present) a secondary job as a part-time lecturer at another (as a rule: a private) university or junior college, 89,4% of the respondents answered positively to this question. The variance is between one (14,0%) and 14 universities given as a maximum (1 respondent). 14% of the respondents had or still have a secondary job at one institution, 14% at two, three (12,9%), four (11,5%) or five (11,5%) institutions.
A last question in this section asked about the ***membership in an academic organization*** and virtually all respondents (there was no missing frequency) told that they were members in such an organization. The variance was quite impressing, starting with membership in just one organization (0,9%) of the respondents up to membership in 25 organizations (also 0,9%). The most often given answer was membership in 5 organizations – which also marks the average. 22,5% of the respondents hold or held a managerial/administrative position in one of these organizations, 16,7% have or had such a position in two, 15,7% in three to five organizations and 3% in 7 to 8 organizations.

1.4 Organizational units inside the university ("chair", "faculty", "department")

A certain number of public universities still adopt the traditional "chair" system, where the chair is the basic unit of the "faculty". In this system the chair-holder has a very powerful and independent position. In some public and most private universities, however, a "department"-system is adopted. Tsukuba University is a reform type of public university and uses new modes of structuring the single units inside the university. A chair holder can, given some special conditions, apply for being granted the status of his chair as an "experimental" one. This means a much better basic financing of the chair and, since an experimental chair is more prestigious than an ordinary one, easier accesses to additional external funding. 45% of the respondents in my survey were working in an institution, which adopted the chair system. Of them a clear majority of 72,9% was affiliated to an "experimental chair".

1.5 Self-evaluation of own institution

Since hierarchical relations as such and specifically the ranking of institutions is of paramount importance in Japan and thus also in the higher education sector, respondents were asked to rank their own institution offering them a choice of five levels. The position of a given institution in the ranking is mostly quite clear in the public, however the result of a highly complex interrelationship of different (objective and subjective, pragmatic and cultural) factors and not necessarily fixed for all times.

Table 1.8: Self-evaluation of own institution

a) measured by quality of research

→ % of respondents ↓ level of self-evaluation	
superior:	41,7%
above average:	25,2%
average:	20,4%
below average:	9,7%
inferior:	2,9%

b) measured by quality of teaching

→ % of respondents ↓ level of self-evaluation	
superior:	33,9%
above average:	27,2%
average:	23,3%
below average:	11,7%
inferior:	3,9%

Evidently, there is quite a difference in the evaluation of the own institution between research and teaching, the latter is seen more critically especially if one looks at how many respondents saw a superior position in this respect.
When cross-calculated with the position of the respondent, then there are no significant variances. However, there are some specifics if one takes into consideration the type of university: The self-confidence was the highest among the members of the national universities: It was mostly them – 93% – who ascribed their own institution a superior ranking in research and 91,4% in teaching, whereas only 4,6% of those who had declared their institution to be superior in research (5,7% in teaching) came from private universities (table 1.9):

Table 1.9: Self-evaluation:

a) quality of research by type of institution

superior:	
- national universities	93,02%
- private universities	4,65%
above average:	
- national universities	57,69%
- private universities	30,76%
- national junior college	2,32%
average:	
- private universities:	47,61%
- private univ. without graduate school	23,80%
- national univ.	19,04%
- private junior college	4,76%
- prefectural university:	4,76%
below average:	
- private junior college	60%
- private universities:	10,0%
- private univ. without graduate school	10%
- national university:	10%
inferior:	
- private universities	66,6%
- private junior college	33,3%

b) quality of teaching by type of university

superior:	
- national univ	91,42%
- private univ.	5,71%
above average:	
- national univ.	64,28%
- full private univ.	21,42%
- private univ. without graduate school	10,71%
average:	
- full private univ	29,16%
- national univ.	25%
- private junior college	25%
- private univ. without graduate school	12,5%
below average:	
- private univ. (total)	50%
- national univ.	25%
- private junior college	16,66%
inferior:	
- private univ. (total)	75%

It is perhaps also worth noting that a clear majority – 87,5% – of the respondents from the Kyoto University gave their university a superior rank in research. The other 12,5% ascribed a rank above average. This is, however, not a surprise since Kyoto University ranks right after the Tokyo University the number one university in Japan. It stands, together with the Tokyo University and some other former "Imperial Universities" for the top group of national respectively all public institutions and is, again together with the Tokyo University and a handful of prestigious private universities the top section of the pyramid-like ranking of the Japanese education system. Seen in this light it is remarkable – and stresses the above mentioned general trend of a more critical attitude towards the quality of teaching – that true not many, but nevertheless some Kyoto University members ranked their own university, as far as teaching is concerned, as "inferior" (1%), "below average" (1,9%) or "average" (1,9%).

The respondents were also asked, if, respectively how, this position in the ranking influenced in their opinion their general work conditions. As could be expected, there was only one member of the Kyoto University who did not see any positive or very positive interrelationship. 22,5% of the respondents saw no influence at all. 57,9% saw a positive, 19,6% a negative correspondence between this rank and their personal work conditions.

2 Questions on personal work conditions in the frame of given university

2.1 Work load: weekly teaching hours

The average work load for teaching was 9,5 (course-) hours per week. A course hour means mostly 50 minutes of class in the case of a single hour lecture and 45 minutes in the case of two-hour lectures. But as in other questions, the variance was high also in this one. 2,9% claimed to have no teaching at all, one person claimed to have given 50 hours of teaching. Cutting off both extremes of alleged 50 hours (the second highest answer was 24 hours) and no teaching at all respectively, then the average teaching load was 10,7 hours per week. There were 15,4% of the respondents who had up to five hours of weekly teaching, then four major groups of respondents who had 6, 8, 10, 12 and 14 hours respectively and 8,7% of respondents who taught more than that. The most often given answer was 12 hours (19% of the sample)

Table 2.1: Teaching hours (course-hours) per week *

hours:	percentage of respondents
1 to 5	15,4%
6	9,6 %
8	14,4 %
10	12,5 %
12	19,2 %
14	10,6 %
up to 10	57,7%
11 to 14	33,6%
15 and more	8,6%

* variance: 0 to 25 hours

As far as the distinction between lectures and seminars is concerned, there was quite an equal distribution between a majority who gave 2 to 4 hours of each lecturing (60,7%) and seminars (84,2%). 55,6% claimed teaching on the graduate level (master, doctor course) with a majority giving 2 to 4 hours per week on this level (63,3%). Still, there were 13,2% who gave 4 to 6 hours of graduate teaching.

2.2 Number of students attending classes

The survey asked also for the number of students in an average class. Since Japan has a restricted access to higher education with the ministry of education defining each year and for each university a prescribed number of freshmen (which must be observed within rather small limits), the assumption was that the number of students per class would be not too large and rather equally distributed over the single types of institutions. The answers do not necessarily refer precisely to the actual situation, but to the quantity the professors perceived or estimated.

Table 2.2: Quantities of students (percentage)

➔ kind of activity ⬇ quantity	lectures	seminars	other
less than 30	20,4	87,0	77,5
30 - 49	23,5	7,8	17,5
50 - 99	29,6	5,2	5,0
100 - 199	22,4	-	-
200 - 299	3,1	-	-
over 300	1,0	-	-

As for the lectures, there are four nearly equal groups of respondents who taught from less than 30 until up to 200 students. In seminars (laboratory training etc.), however, a clear majority of the professors taught less than 30 students. In no case there were more than 100 students.
The teacher-student relation in Japanese higher education is quite diversified. The public institutions are generally much better staffed than the private ones. But especially among the latter, differences are great with the good private universities at least having similar conditions like the good public universities. However, private institutions often have a satisfactory teacher-student relation only, because they employ large numbers of non-regular, external teachers .

*Table 2.3: Teacher-student-relation in Japanese higher education (1990)**

➔ type of institution ⬇ type of teacher	national and other public univ.	private univ.	junior college
students per full professor	31,6	60,6	62,6
students per assistant professor	36,1	123,0	84,6
students per lecturer	94,6	153,0	101,4
total	14,3	32,1	18,0

Source: Mombu soukei yoran, heisei, san nen, S. 76-77 u. 84-85.
*regular full-time staff only

2.3 Working time spent for different activities

In this section professors were first asked to estimate how much time they spent for different activities and in a second step to reflect how much time they would regard as an optimum to be spent for the given activity.

Table 2.4: Distribution of time (actual and optimal) in average

→ activity ↓ mode	teaching	research	examinations	administration	other
actual	30,0	34,8	7,3	17,8	9,0
optimal	26,4	51,6	5,5	9,6	5,9

In detail there were quite great variances, therefore I should like to quote the single items separately:

Table 2.5: Time for teaching seen as optimal

→ frequency of answers a) actual time b) optimal time ↓percentage of time for teaching	a) actual	b) optimal
under 10 %	7%	4%
10 - 20 %	27,4%	37,2%
21 - 30 %	30,4%	35,3%
31 - 40 %	18,6%	17,7%
41 - 50 %	9,8%	5,9%
over 50 %	6,9%	-

The largest group of answers claimed a share of 30 percent of the total working time spent on teaching (24,5%), followed by 40 hours (17,6) and 20 hours (13,7).
The largest group of respondents regarded 30 % of the total working time for teaching as an optimum. The second largest group was 20% (22,5% of the respondents). After that there followed still two larger groups who stated an optimal share of 40% (15,7% of the respondents) and of 10 % (11,8% of the respondents).

Table 2.6: Time for research, actual time and optimal time

→ frequency of answers a) actual time b) optimal time ↓percentage of time for research	a) actual	b) optimal
under 10 %	2%	-
10 - 20 %	26,6%	-
21 - 30 %	29,5%	7,9%
31 - 40 %	20,6%	21,6%
41 - 50 %	9,9%	39,3%
over 50 %	11%	31,4%

As for the actual distribution of time spent for research, answers were quite diversified apart from three large groups of respondents: Most of them 26,5% claimed a share of 30% of total work time spent for research, the second largest group (18,6% of the respondents) stated a share of 20% and 16,7% stated a share of 40%

Virtually no one in the sample would like to spend less than at least 25% of the total working time on research. The largest group of respondents (32,4% of the sample) stated an optimum of 50% of the working time for research, followed by a group of 18,6% of the sample who state an optimum of 40% and a next larger group of 12,7% of the sample with a suggested optimum of 60% of total working time for research.

Table 2.7: Time spent for examinations, actual time and optimal time

➔ frequency of answers a) actual time b) optimal time ↓ percentage of time	a) actual	b) optimal
0 %	9,8 %	15,7 %
1 - 5 %	45,1 %	53,9 %
6 - 10 %	33,4 %	28,5 %
11 - 15 %	5,9 %	1 %
16 - 20 %	4,9 %	1 %
21 - 30 %	1,0 %	-
over 30 %	-	-

As could be expected, the work load for examinations is rather unpopular with as much as 15,7 % of the respondents claiming no examination time as optimal. However, the majority of respondents seem to be realistic about this question but would somewhat reduce this type of work.

Table 2.8: Time spent for administration, actual time and optimal time

➔ frequency of answers a) actual time b) optimal time ↓ percentage of time for administration	a) actual	b) optimal
0 %	3,9 %	7,8 %
1 - 5 %	9,9 %	30,4 %
6 - 10 %	31,3%	41,2 %
11 - 15 %	12,8 %	7,8 %
16 - 20 %	15,7%	8,8 %
21 - 30 %	16,7%	2,0 %
over 30 %	9,9%	1 %

Most respondents (28,4% of the sample) claimed a share of 10 % of total time for administration, which seems to be reasonable. However, quite large parts of the faculty seem to be overloaded with as much as 42,3% of the sample stating more than 15 % of their work being spent on administration. Although some respect -- or wish -- quite large shares for administration, the overwhelming majority of the sample see up to 10% of time for administration as an optimum.

Table 2.9: Time spent for other activities, actual time and optimal time

→ frequency of answers a) actual time b) optimal time ↓ percentage of time for other activities	a) actual	b) optimal
0 %	51,0 %	57,8 %
1 - 5 %	7,8 %	14,7 %
6 - 10 %	12,8 %	10,8 %
11 - 15 %	7,9 %	3,0 %
16 - 20 %	5,9 %	5,9 %
21 - 30 %	6,9 %	4,9 %
over 30 %	7,9 %	3,0 %

Some respondents specified these other activities and the most typical and several times quoted activities were:

- "activities in academic societies, boards, councils"
- "student's guidance" (including "communication with the students", special guidance, for instance for dissertation etc.)
- "preparation of lessons"
- "practical training"
- "preparation of examinations"
- "more time for reflecting the giving of marks"
- "service for the local community"
- "lectures" (outside university, public, on conferences etc.)
- "union-related activities".

Some other activities were quoted only once:
- (inner-university) "activities outside the department"
- (additional) "part-time work as lecturer...researcher in another university"
- (activity) "outside school in public affairs"
- "social activities (boards, councils)"
- "dissertation guidance...survey on dissertations"
- "training in industry"
- "establishing and maintaining of good relations" (among the faculty)

Summarizing this section it might be said that the difference between the actual time spent for different work activities and the time seen as optimal are sometimes quite striking. As far as teaching and research is concerned, the Japanese professors in the sample have an average teaching load, which takes 30% of their total working time. They would prefer to have slightly less than (26,4%). Much larger is the difference between actual and optimal distribution as far as research is concerned. It can be also said that large parts of this preferred additional time for research would not be at the expense of teaching but of time for examination, other activities and especially of administration.

2.4 Overall work time of the professors

Table 2.10: Weekly working time (hours per week)

➔percentage of sample 🡻hours per week	
under 10	3 %
11 - 20	6,9 %
21 - 39	11,8 %
40 - 50	36,3 %
51 - 60	22,5 %
61 - 70	12,7 %

Weekly working time during semester was in average 59 hours: There were 4 major groups with 40, 50, 60 and 70 hours (10,8%, 13,7%, 17,6% and 8,8% of the sample respectively). Apart from this, there was a wide range from 2 hours per week up to 80 hours with the different values mostly given from one to 4 persons. About half of the questioned claimed to have worked up to 48 hours, the other half has worked more than that.

3 Organizational and financial conditions of research and teaching

3.1 Affiliation to organizational units and academic subjects represented in the sample

In this section the denomination of the correspondent department was asked. Typically, "faculty", respectively "department" (or "college in the English system) is "gakubu" in Japanese. The Liberal Arts Department in public universities (which includes teaching in Languages, Sports and various general subjects in the first two years of study and which was compulsory for all students up to 1992) is called "kyouyoubu". Many private universities do not have a separate "kyouyoubu", but they are obliged to offer the mentioned Liberal Art subjects. Typically (at least in the public institutions), the faculties/departments are further divided into "institutes" ("kenkyuushitsu" "research room" in literal translation) and in "chairs" ("kouza"). The experimental national University of Tsukuba introduced a reformed structure where research and teaching are organized in two separate structures of "gakkei" (see also appendix, the selected commentaries).
The distribution of departments (faculties) and academic subjects represented by the sample can be seen from table 3.1:

Table 3.1: Departments, academic subjects represented in the sample

➔ cases ⬇ department/subjects	
Dept. of Agriculture: Forestry	2
Dept. of Commercial Sciences: Tax System Analysis	1
Dept. of Economy: Economical Law	1
Dept. of Economy: Economical Development	1
Dept. of Economy: general, not specified	3
Dept. of Economy: Market and Accounting Analysis	1
Dept. of Engineering: Chemical Industry	2
Dept. of Engineering: Electrical Engineering	3
Dept. of Engineering: general, not specified	3
Dept. of Engineering: Management of Engineering	1
Dept. of Engineering: Mechanical Engineering	1
Dept. of Engineering: Technology of Photography	2
Dept. of Engineering: Physical Engineering	2
Dept. of Education : Psychology, Clinical Psychology	2
Dept. of Education general or not specified	9
Dept. of Education: Comparative Ed.	3
Dept. of Education: Health Ed.	1
Dept. of Education: Japanese for Foreigners	2
Dept. of Education: Music Ed.	2
Dept. of Education: Philosophy of Ed.	1
Dept. of Education: Pre-school Ed.	2
Dept. of Education: Sociology of Ed.	4
Dept. of Foreign Languages general	1

Dept. of International Studies	1
Humanities Dept.:* Administration of Education	1
Humanities Dept.: Domestic Sciences	1
Humanities Dept.: Education, general, not specified	5
Humanities Dept.: Educational Law	1
Humanities Dept.: English Language and Culture	1
Humanities Dept.: French Language and Culture	1
Humanities Dept.: general, not specified	6
Humanities Dept.: History	2
Humanities Dept.: History of Education	1
Humanities Dept.: History of Technology	1
Humanities Dept.: Japanese Studies	1
Humanities Dept.: Philosophy	1
Law Dept.	1
Liberal Arts Dept.: Engineering	1
Liberal Arts Dept**.: English	1
Liberal Arts Dept.: Foreign Languages	1
Liberal Arts Dept.: French	1
Liberal Arts Dept.: German	1
Liberal Arts Dept.: Mathematics	2
Liberal Arts Dept.: Psychology	1
Liberal Arts Dept.: Sociology	2
Liberal Arts Dept.: Sciences	1
Liberal Arts Dept.: Teacher Training	1
Department of Management	1
Dept. of Mathematics	1
Dept. of Pharmacy	2
Dept. of Science: Astronomy	1
Dept. of Science: Geophysics	1
Dept. of Science: Molecular Physics	1
Dept. of Science: Zoology	1
Dept. of Sociology	4
Others:	8
Together	106

* Liberal Arts Dept. = "kyouyoubu"

** Humanities = bungakubu"," jinbungaku", "ningengakurui", "ningenkagakubu", "seikatzukagakubu"

As for the department, most respondents came from Education (26) and Dept of Humanities (22) followed by Engineering (14), Liberal Arts Dept. (12), Dept. of Economy (6) and the others. The situation is somewhat different if one distinguishes not between departments, but between the academic subjects the single professors teach.

3.2 Relevance of the respective organizational unit for research, teaching and material conditions

In this section it was asked, which of the organizational units in the given institution are most important for planing and realization of the respondent's: a) research, b) teaching, c) material work conditions.
On the whole following organizational units were named: the university/college as a whole, gakubu, gakkei, kenkyushitsu, koza, daikoza, gakka, senko. In principle gakubu and gakkei are to be compared to faculty respectively department, kenkyushitsu is the next level dividing the faculty into institutes (for example: Faculty of Education, Institute of Sociology of Education) kouza is the chair and as such (where a chair-system exists) the next smaller unit. Apart from this there is also an organizational form joining together some chairs to a so called "great chair" (daikouza), which functionally corresponds with a department. Also answers referred to Liberal Arts Dept. faculty meeting (iinkai) refer to the level of department/faculty. Senkou, respectively gakka ("specializations") is not necessarily an organizational unit (but might be in a college, which has only one or few departments), but was named quite often as a most relevant unit. Comparable systematization, however, is difficult for the diversity of organizational structure. Nevertheless the distinction could be made between the highest level of the whole university/college, the next middle level of faculty/department and the next smaller unit institute, chair or specialization.

Table 3.2: Most important organizational unit for research, teaching, material conditions

→org. unit ↓ conditions	ministry of educ.	univ./ college	gakubu/gakkei daikoza.	kenkyu-shitsu	chair	gakka/ senko
research		2	9	20	12	15
teaching		1	16	13	4	34
material cond.	1	8	27	13	6	13

(multiple answers possible)

Apparently respondents tend to estimate very highly the importance of the lower organizational levels. This is especially true for the conditions of research and still more evident for teaching. However, for the material conditions are the upper organizational units, faculty/department and (to a lesser degree and especially in the case of specialized colleges) the institution as a whole very important. Remarkably enough, only one respondent named the Ministry of Education as being responsible for the material conditions of his work place. Another respondent who came from a prefectural university stated "some level higher than the faculty (in fact the prefectural government)". In summary, the answers do not seem to support an interpretation in which the professors feel to be exposed to an uncontrollable hierarchical and centralized power structure inside the university. This was stressed in some answers that, for misunderstanding the question (because the organization was asked) or deliberately answered that they "individually" were responsible for the research or teaching conditions.

3.3 Size of the organizational unit

The professors were asked if compared with other faculties/departments in their university they consider their own faculty/department to be large, medium-size or small (measured by the quantity of students). 39,4% of the professors estimated their own departments/faculties as being large, 21,2% as being medium-size, and 23,2% responded that their faculty/department was small.

3.4 Allocation of the budget. Decisions over curriculum

The allocation of the budget is apparently a highly complicated matter as far as the organizational and competence structure in detail is concerned. This is true especially in respect to the multitude of private universities and their different management models. Though, even in the public sector the criteria for distributing the budget are not always uniform: An actual preference for the former "imperial universities", with Tokyo and Kyoto Universities at the top, can be observed traditionally: An analysis from 1975 showed that both institutions together had 8,6% students of all national universities enrolled, but received 14,9% of the total expenditure for the national universities. All former 7 "imperial universities" who together held a share of 24% of all students in national universities, received 35,7% of the expenditure.[4] As far as the single university is concerned, there seems to be great diversity, and in some cases I learned in the interviews about very sophisticated and differentiated keys of how the budget is divided. There is certainly a great difference also between the formal and the informal ways and modes of allocating the finances and, more generally, of the power structures inside the institutions. My study did not aim at analyzing these questions. Also most of the interviewed respondents were highly unfamiliar with the matter and how co-ordination is done in the administration office. Nevertheless, I tried to find out how the professors feel about being involved in these structures as active partners with equal rights, or if they see themselves rather as being exposed to decision making on a more elevated or abstract level. As a rule in small universities there is a general assembly meeting where all professors are participating in the discussions on budget allocation. In larger institutions, faculty/department meetings have the same function but in this case there might be a competition between single departments especially since the academic world in Japan is very hierarchical. Competition is found not only between the single institutions, but also between the single departments with some having a very high prestige (and power?) and others rather to be found at the bottom of the pyramid. This hierarchy is also reflected in the fact that the selectivity of the entrance examinations mostly corresponds with this prestige hierarchy. Another possible reason for conflict can be found in the division between the Liberal Arts Department at the one side and the other departments on the other side. Specialized colleges or departments of science and applied sciences might tend to regard the Liberal Arts as something less important for their profile. In fact, not all universities do have independent Liberal Arts Departments (although all apply to the principle that a set of general subjects is offered to be taken during the first two years) and one of the mayor reform measures during the last years was the new regulation which on the one hand gives room for experiments with creating

---

[4] Shogo Ichikawa: Finance of Higher Education. In: W. Cummings, I. Amano et al. (editors): Changes in the Japanese University. A comparative Persepcitve. New York 1979, p. 44.

a new vertical integration of the courses of studies in the national universities. For all universities the former set of compulsory general courses (including foreign languages, sports and others) are going to become electives.
Although professors are completely free as far as the methods and contents of their lectures are concerned, nevertheless, it is highly probable that the existing power structure that influences the distribution of the budget, probably does also influence the decisions over such curricular questions like opening of new courses of study, compulsory and non-compulsory contents of lectures and similar questions. Again, as in the question on allocation of the budget (and in many other sections of the questionnaire) not the "objective" structure – in this case power and decision making structure – was asked, but the estimation of those who are involved in or exposed to those processes.

Table 3.3: Allocation of the budget, competence over curriculum (in percentage)

1) allocation of the budget	
equal competence	71,6
size of the faculty/department	14,8
other criteria	13,6
2) decisions over curriculum	
equal competencies, power	80,9
large faculties more powerful	7,9
other	11,2

A majority of 71,6% of the respondents meant that in their higher educational institution all faculties had an equal competence as far as the allocation of the budget was concerned. 14,8% stated that the budget was allocated depending on the number of students, 13,6% suggested other criteria, but mostly had not specified them. Two respondents referred to the fact that there are different criteria of allocating the budget for the Liberal Arts Department at the one hand and for the other departments on the other hand. Another respondent suggested, that tradition, age and the strength of the ego of the single person are decisive for the actual position in the power and decision-making structure.
Other answers were:

- (on allocation): "Basically there are no differences between the departments as far as their competencies are concerned, but as a tendency it can be observed that the different history and tradition of a given department and the differences of prestige in the scientific community exert a little bit of influence". (on decision over curriculum) "There are no special regulative conditions" (private university)
- (on allocation of the budget): "size might also play a leading role, but sometimes the power structure has a big influence, I think" (national university).
- "The university president´s and the board of the director´s decision has priority over the decisions of the faculty meeting" (private junior college)
- (on allocation of the budget): decision is made "on the level of the whole institution, and administratively"; (on decision over curriculum) "decided from the plenary session of the departments general faculty meeting" (national university)

- "decisions over the curriculum: "the school affairs main conference" (private university)
- "the research budget is distributed to the single professors"
- (on decisions over curriculum): dependent on "the self-governing ability of each single department" (national university)
- (on both): "the competence of the department is based neither on arbitrariness nor on power-play" (national reform-university)
- (on allocation of the budget): criteria are: "the number of teachers and students and the number of experimental subjects" (Technological College)
- (on decisions over curriculum): dependent on "consciousness of the teacher".
- (on both) criteria are: "rather the size and characteristics of the single subject/field of research than the size of the faculty/department." (private university).

3.5 Allocation of the budget based on objective criteria?

42,3% of the respondents think that the allocation of the budget is based on objective criteria, but the majority of 57,7% do not think so.

3.6 Changes of student and teacher figures

a) Changes in student figures:
   - increase: 61,5%
   - decrease: 7,3%
   - no change: 31,3%

Since during the last years the 18 year old population grew steadily (the peak was reached in 1993 and will decline in the future) it is not surprising that a majority of respondents told that there was an increase in student enrolment at their department/faculty. The Ministry of Education sets a fixed number of new enrolment each year for most public and private universities, which must be observed in certain (rather narrow) limits. Apart form cases in which the ministry reacted to the growing demand for higher education by extending the limits, also many relatively unpopular departments or institutions might have profited from the boom of applicants. Nevertheless, a relatively large number of respondents did not see any increase of students figures in their department.

Table 3.4:

Changes of student figures: increase

increased (quantity percent)	cases (percent)
up to 9%	15,2 %
10 - 20%	39,2%
30%	17 %
50%	8,7%
100%	2,2%

Changes of student figures: decrease

decreased (quantity percent)	cases (percent)
up to 10%	42,9%
10%	42,9%
25%	14,3%

b) Changes in teacher figures:
- increased: 58,1%
- decreased: 5,4%
- no change: 36,6%

3.7 Present financial situation of the higher education sector compared with a decade ago

A clear majority, 80%, of respondents thought that the present financial situation of higher education was worse than a decade ago. These respondents were asked further if they thought this to be the result of a definite retrenchment towards the higher education sector adopted by the government. Again, an overwhelming majority of 89 % thought that this is the case.

3.8 Change of overall material conditions during past five years

Table 3.5 Change of material conditions during past five years in the own department

→ % of sample ↓ change:	
very much improved	5%
somewhat improved	32,7%
no change	28,7%
somewhat deteriorated	26,7%
very much deteriorated	6,9%

Interestingly enough, whereas an outstanding majority of respondents saw a general deterioration of financing higher education and again a majority of these attributed this to a retrenchment policy, only 33,6 % of the respondents quoted that their personal material work conditions deteriorated – and only 7% saw very much deterioration. Partly this is understandable when one takes into account that the "privileged", that is, full professors, and among these holders of experimental chairs are over-represented in the sample. It is probably they who personally do not feel any deterioration, many of them even improvement. The answers might however, reflect the differences between a general mood, which is perpetuated and assured in the media and through other channels of communication, which however does not fully correspond to the personal experiences. As a whole however, it is necessary to note that there are tremendous differences of

material conditions from university to university in Japan, especially in respect to buildings, space and equipment. Average figures in this case do not tell so much.

3.9 Research funds from outside university

61% of the professors received some funds from outside their own institution. The funds came mostly from public sources, were granted for team projects and came in half the cases up to more than 50% compared with the regular funds for research, which the professors received from their institution.

Table 3.6: Sources of external research funds

→ percentage of sample ↓ sources	
private	6,3
public	62, 5
private and public	31,3

Table 3.7: Receiver

→ percentage of sample ↓ Receiver	
individual	18,8%
team	51,6%
individual and team	29,7%

Table 3.8: External fund compared with regular fund

→ percentage of sample ↓ percentage of regular fund	
less than 5%	4,7%
6 - 10%	12,5%
between 10 and 20%	15,6%
between 20 and 50%	17,2%
more than 50%	50,0%

3.10 Importance of different sources for applying for and receiving external research funds

Asked, which source is generally the most important for applying for external funds the professors put unequivocally the national agencies at the first place (95,2%). On the second place the largest group (42.1%) named private industry, the second largest group other than national or regional public sources. On the third place again private industry was regarded as most important (50%), international (39%) and other (that is non-industrial) private agencies (20%) followed.

The distinction between positions and types of institutions show clearly some differences as far as the access to external funds is concerned: Apparently full professors have the easiest access to external funds and the lecturers (from whom not one received some research funds individually) the most difficult access. Public institutions have much better chances to get some funds than private ones (Table 3.9.):

Table 3.9: Received external research funds by position, type of institution

➔ type of prof./instit. ⬇ source/ conditions	full profs.	assistant profs.	lecturers	members of public instit.	members of private instit.
a) received funds, % of total sample	30,5	23,8	5,7	44,8	16,2
% of a) private sources	12,5	0	0	6,4	5,9
% of a) public sources	50,0	72	83,3	61,7	64,8
% of a) comb. private/public sources	37,5	28	16,7	31,9	29,4
% of a) individually	28,1	12	0	21,3	11,8
% of a) in team	43,7	60	50	48,9	58,8
% of a) comb. indiv./team	28,1	28	50	29,8	29,4

3.11 Retrenchment measures and their effect on teaching and research

39,6% of the questioned professors declared that their department had been exposed to direct retrenchment measures during the past five years, 60,4% resented this statement. From those who experienced retrenchment, the strongest negative effect was felt in the quality of research, then in student guidance and the amount of research. Surprisingly enough, quality and quantity of teaching seemed not to be affected very strongly, as a tendency.

Table 3.10: Negative effects on various work-related activities of the professors

➔ level of influence ⬇activity	0 -	1 +	2 ++	3 +++	4 ++++
a) student guidance:	25,0	22,2	25,0	25,0	2,8
b) amount of research	5,4	21,6	32,4	24,3	16,2
c) quality of research	16,2	10,8	29,7	16,2	27,0
d) number of publications	36,1	22,2	33,3	2,8	5,6
e) quantity of teaching	45,9	18,9	16,2	16,2	2,7
f) quality of teaching	37,8	18,9	21,6	16,2	5,4

Cross calculation effect of retrenchment and position:
A big difference can be found in so far as assistant professors see much more very strong effects (level 4) than regular professors. Otherwise there are no significant differences.

3.12 Level of satisfaction with various aspects of work conditions

Table 3.11: Level of satisfaction with various aspects of work conditions

→ level of satisfaction/percentage of the samp ↓ aspect	-2	-1	1	2
a) time for teaching	16,3	45,3	32,1	7,7
b) time for administration	36,2	44,8	17,1	1,9
c) salary	37,7	38,7	23,6	-
d) general work conditions	12,9	38,6	44,6	4,0
e1) space	31,7	33,7	31,7	2,9
e2) equipment	35,6	37,5	25,0	1,9
f) communication with colleagues	6,7	18,1	65,7	9,5
g) communication with students	2,9	26,0	56,7	14,4
h) students knowledge/interest	24,5	49,1	22,6	3,8
i) image profession in society	1,9	12,4	75,2	10,5
j) image own univ. in society	5,7	26,7	54,3	13,3
k) image faculty in university	16,2	39,4	41,4	3,0

Cross calculations:
On the whole there were no significant differences except for two aspects: There seems to be a higher level of satisfaction among the regular professors (46,6%) compared with the assistant professors (30%) as far as time for teaching is concerned. Satisfaction with "time for teaching" apparently means that they do not feel overloaded with time for teaching. This satisfaction with time for teaching is slightly higher among professors than assistant professors (46,6 against 30%). In respect to the salary there was a significant difference between the male professors (21% were content) as compared with the women professors (66% content). Though the sample of women professors is extremely small and not representative in any way (except for the general small representation of women professors at the university) it seems plausible that woman professors, for whom the position of a university professor is an exceptionally high ranked and well-paid job, are more content with the salary than their male colleagues.

3.13 Change of satisfaction during the past 5 to 10 years

Table 3.12: Change of satisfaction during the past 5 to 10 years.

- 2	- 1	no change	+ 1	+ 2
3,9	22,5	49,0	23,5	1,0

About half of the respondents saw no change in their general satisfaction with their work (which was defined as the sum of the single aspects in the foregoing section). The rest experienced to nearly equal shares a grown dissatisfaction respectively satisfaction.

Cross calculation:
Much more assistant professors (64%) experienced no change in their general satisfaction (dissatisfaction is a little higher than satisfaction). However, full professors had less stable feelings: only 39% felt no change at all, and both, those who felt a growing dissatisfaction and those who became gradually more satisfied were larger (with the latter being slightly higher than expressing dissatisfaction).

3.14 Change of climate: deterioration of co-operation and work dedication during the past 5-10 years

Slightly more than the half (54%) of the questioned professors answered this question negatively, the rest (46%) consented with the statement that co-operation and work dedication deteriorated. 39,1% of these declared that this was a result of retrenchment policy towards the higher education sector, 60,9% of the professors saw no such correlation but other reasons and many of them specified these reasons. Since the question was unspecified, the respondents referred to various topics (which by the way are not always without link to retrenchment respectively financial problems). Some of the quoted reasons for change of climate were:

- "reduction of positions for research assistants"
- "the ignorance and negligence of the country and of the government towards science and culture which bordering on inferiority of cognition; the weakness of the ministry of education´s higher education (university) bureau (the difference in the competencies and power of the bureau for primary and secondary education and the bureau for international science affairs is obvious)"
- "the care for dedication and co-operation is getting lost in society in general"
- "reduction of capacity"
- "the conservatism of the university itself, inflexibility, bureaucracy, authoritarianism"
- "because the reliability among the members of the faculty disintegrated"
- "because of the multitude of miscellaneous duties"
- "the decrease of talent of the teachers and the decrease of study abilities of the students"
- "the efforts of the single persons are not sufficient"
- "shortage of number of professors"
- "the general laxity of society"

- " time for research is absolutely insufficient. There is too much time for teaching and administration"
- "nowadays self-content"
- "the problem of talent of the academic teaching staff"
- "the feudal structures"
- "many conferences. Many teachers have to spend much time for administration and management"
- "the isolation of separate research leading to egoism is one of the reasons"
- "the low recognition of research through the board of directors and others and the submissiveness to this attitude by many teachers"
- "the growing harshness in human relations"
- "the marketizing of education"

4 Prospects of university's role and conditions

4.1 Aspects of massification

Table 4.1: "Massification of higher education will continue"

→ scale agreement/ disagreement	agree strongly +2	agree +1	disagree -1	disagree strongly -2
	18,1%	52,4%	29,5%	-

In Japan the 18 years old population is decreasing sharply from 1993 on. Nevertheless the majority of 70,5% of the questioned believed that massification of the higher education sector will continue also in future.

Table 4.2: "Growing competition among students for admission to higher education (to highly reputed universities) also in future"

→ scale	+2	+1	-1	-2
	60,4%	35,8%	3,8%	

The overwhelming majority of the professors (96,2) is convinced that competition among students for admission to highly reputed universities will increase also in the future.

Table 4.3: "Growing competition among higher education institutions for students"

→ scale	+2	+ 1	-1	-2
	51,4%	43,8%	3,8%	1,0%

Again the overwhelming majority (95,2%) of the respondents believe that since the group of 18 years old will become smaller, higher education institutions will have to compete still to a higher degree than today in order to secure their enrolment figures.

Table 4.4: "The quantitative changes in the group of 18 years old will not affect my institution"

→ scale	+ 2	+ 1	-1	-2
	8,6%	32,4%	40,0%	19,0%

Although nearly all respondents believed that the single universities would have to face increasing competition in order to attract students they are somewhat more optimistic as far as their own institution is concerned: nearly 60% did not expect any effect.

Table 4.5: "Retrenchment policy respectively cutting the budgets for education and research is no problem for my institution"

➔ scale	+2	+1	-1	-2
	2,8%	7,5%	50,9%	38,7%

Although in section 3.11 the majority of respondents (60,4%) had stated that so far their own department had not been hit by retrenchment measures, only very few (10,3%) believe that retrenchment is no problem for their institution.

4.2 Strategies to cope with financial problems/assessment of planned strategies and measures taken so far

Table 4.6: Strategy planned/assessment of planned (introduced) strategy

➔ strategy planed, measure taken?/assessment of strategy, measure ↓ content of strategy/measure	yes	+2	+1	- 1	- 2
a) increased advertising	70,8%	34,7%	51,5%	10,9%	3,0%
b) raising tuition fee	62,6%	3,0%	18,2%	46,5%	32,3%
c) univ. facilities for commercial purpose	9,6 %	7,4	29,5	30,5%	32,6%
d) cut number of faculties	7,5	-	18,9	31,6	49,5
e) cut nr. of faculty members	28,1	-	13,3	33,0	53,6
f) cut material costs	40,4	2,1	12,4	35,1	50,5
g) stronger ties with high schools	23,3	4,1	30,9	37,1	27,3
h) keener admiss. selection	12,8	11,8	40,9	36,6	10,8
i) offer better student´s life conditions/tutoring etc.	34,8	24,0	58,3	12,5	5,2
j) unique profile	62,4	35,7	50,0	13,3	1,0
k) stress quality of research	40,2	24,7	50,5	20,4	4,3
l) new courses/facilities	64,1	34,7	51,6	12,6	1,1
m) stress quality of teaching	45,7	35,8	50,5	12,6	1,1
n) try to attract more external money	57,0	29,6	50,0	18,4	2,0

4.3 Evaluation of higher education institutions

More than half of the respondents – 57,7% – consented to the suggestion that Japanese universities and colleges should be regularly evaluated, given that state of the art criteria for measuring academic and educational qualities would be applied. Those respondents who agreed to evaluation were asked to express their agreement or disagreement with the following statements (table 4.7):

Table 4.7: Agree with evaluation and agree with the following statements

➔ level of agreement ↓ statement	do not agree	agree more or less	agree strongly
a) evaluation would reduce the influence of "exam hell"	74,1	24,1	1,7
b) special profile of a given institution becomes more visible	6,7	55,0	38,3
c) evaluation and knowledge of special profile could lead to more rational allocation of budget	35,6	49,2	15,3
d) evaluation would stimulate research and teaching quality	3,3	43,3	53,3

It is worth noting that in the meantime, that is since the start of this pilot study, regular evaluation of higher education institutions has been gradually discussed more and more seriously, since the ministry of education during the last years has given to the universities more freedom for organizing their affairs, but at the same time urged them to improve teaching and research quality. However, the ministry´s (or some of the minister's fraction) strategy is believed to aim farther, that is to break up the present formally homogenous system and to come to a new structure of higher education where different levels of institutions will be clearly distinct in terms of academic and professional courses. A part of the institutions would be converted into colleges with teaching obligation but without funding of research. How far evaluation and its consequences will go is not clear at present. When the questionnaire was distributed (October 1991), some first experiments were carried out. For instance a private enterprise videotaped how university graduates commented the institution they left, including the comments on professors giving their full name. In 1992 some universities and colleges took the initiative which in the beginning was not more than publishing faculty profiles in order to inform students and colleagues. In these publications, professors gave their personal record as well as their educational background, and other information they deemed to be important. In the meantime a Japan University Accreditation Association, a non-profit organization recognized by the Ministry of Education was founded. It counts already on a membership of 358 institutions thus including already nearly 70% of all public and private universities and colleges. These member-institutions will introduce a mutual-evaluation system to evaluate the education and research activities of the institutions. So far this system is based on self-examinations of the given institution's educational and research activities, which will be reported to the association. The association will set up

an own committee in order to check the self-evaluation system, its methods and eventual reform measures in reaction to the evaluation
Some of the items required for the self-evaluation will be teaching conditions, faculty organization, education and research activities, management and operation of the institution.

5 Summary and some comparisons

I should like to make some remarks in respect of two different levels: First some reflections upon methodological problems, which are conditioned by the fact, that this survey has the character of a pilot study and a possible follow-up study is planed especially from the point of view of international comparability. Secondly I should like to mention some few outcomes, which are especially conspicuous either as such, or in comparison with outcomes of the German study.

5.1 Technical and methodical aspects

First of all there was quite a great number of respondents who used the offered opportunity to make some verbal comments. Some respondents made comments over general or partial aspects of Japanese higher education or of their respective institution. These responses are presented in the annex. Many other respondents made commentaries on the survey in summary or to some special parts of it. There were some questions, which were relatively often criticized as being unclear or difficult to answer. This is especially true for the questions related with the allocating of the budget in the university respectively the departments. This question refers to the context of an increased trend of "marketizing" the educational system, and seen in this context it will become more relevant than ever, who (and how) will be involved in playing an active role in this "market". For, if really the North American system is a model of the present trend - many professors in Japan believe this to be the implications of the ministry's policy, and also one respondent expressed this assumption in his comments -- than this will probably also change the function of the departments in order to become more "product-cost and product-output oriented" units that actively share in the management of the whole school. Interestingly, one of the respondents holds, that many professors do not care about these questions (see annex) and he suggested this to make the theme of an own survey. However, I am aware, that the correspondent question should be much more precise in a possible follow-up study. Other criticism referred to question 4.3. where the consent with an "objective evaluation" was questioned. It goes without saying that the consent over what is "objective" is not given and thus it is probably not easy to answer to such a question.

Apart from those detailed questions, on the level of the formulations of single questions, there are some technical aspects of comparison I should like to mention: Many questions (and the general structure of the questionnaire) are related to the Canadian, French and German projects mentioned in the beginning. Thus some questions originating from a context in which they are very important, are not necessarily so in another country. This refers for instance to questions, which originally ask for possible factors influencing the management and power position of departments (such as size of departments) or ask for management experiences of the single persons (for instance question I.7.). Both seem to be relevant in the North American universities and colleges, especially then in the private sector, where the ability of single departments to attract large numbers (of fee-paying and gifted) students can provide them with a strong position and where the possibilities and needs of a good management on this level are quite important. In contrast Japanese (or as for that: German) universities and colleges are largely dependent on an administrative allocation of the budget. True, private universities in Japan might be more independent from the ministry in this respect than for instance German universi-

ties. On the other hand does the "tei-in" the prescription of the yearly intake of new students give the ministry a strong control-tool. Apparently, the respective items can not be compared directly. Nevertheless, a somewhat broadened hypothesis could for instance assume, that strong involvement in managing activities outside university (in academic associations, etc.) could correlate with better skills to attract additional research funds from outside university. Apparently, the sample in the case of our survey was much too small to find any such correlation. As for the size of the department there is evidence that it does not play any decisive role in the majority of cases, although some respondents think so. Another type of questions asks for specific issues connected with the actual context of population figures or educational policy issues. This is the case for instance with the fact, that the number of 18 years old will decrease dramatically in Japan in the years to come or issues like the functionality and desirability of quality evaluation of institutions, departments and persons. On the other hand, as for the shifts in population figures, this is a general point of relevance since there is always the need to harmonize the relationships between the different subsystems (population, education, employment systems). The problem of this interrelationship can be subsumed under a general comparative category even if the actual single situations in the different countries might be unique. As for the question of evaluating the output of universities and colleges, it might be noted that even in countries where such an evaluation has been tabooed for a long time, like for instance in Germany, there are strong tendencies (and even recent experiments) to introduce some evaluation and, connected with this, a new vertical differentiation of the higher education system. Probably this can be seen in the general context of massification of higher education. In it the clinging to an alleged equivalence of all institutions of one type becomes a source of structural and functional discrepancies and of inefficiency. Apart from this, the issue of an increasing vertical differentiation and hierarchization fits well into a broader context of retrenchment policy and the correspondent general ideology of separation instead of integration. In the given context investors preferably turn attention only to the economically most fit and effective individuals or institutions. In summary: the character of a pilot study enables and even necessitates to reflect upon categories of comparison, which go beyond the level of denominating single phenomena.

5.2 Contents and some comparison

At the end I should like to make some rather unsystematic comparisons, first in respect to the work load that is, the working time and the numbers of students to be taken care of. Some of the outcomes are not very striking as such: For instance, it could be expected that the professors would estimate their working time to be very high. Surprisingly enough, the average of 60 hours per week was not only the outcome of the Japanese but also of the German study[5]. The situation is somewhat different in respect to the distinctions between the actual time spent for various activities and the time to be spent for these activities seen as optimal or wishful both by the Japanese and the German professors. First of all, and this again is not very surprising, both groups of re-

[5] All figures quoted from: Botho von Kopp, Manfred Weiß: Der "Arbeitsplatz Universität" und die Zukunft der Hochschulen aus der Sicht von Hochschullehrern. Eine Internationale Vergleichsuntersuchung. Erster Ergebnisbericht. Frankfurt: Deutsches Institut für Internationale Pädagogische Forschung 1993

spondents felt an overload of teaching and of administration (other activities), which they would like to reduce somewhat. However, there are quite remarkable differences between the workload for teaching of the Japanese respondents (30% of the time) and of the German respondents (38%). Accordingly, the Japanese professors give a much lower figure for optimal time for teaching (26,4% in average) than their German counterparts (34%). As for research again the tendency is the same, but the time shares for this activity are very different: whereas the German respondents would regard a share of 42% of their total working time spent for research as optimal, the Japanese respondents desired in average more than 51%. Notwithstanding those differences, both activities together take nearly the same amount of time (64% respectively 65%) and also the desirable amount of administration, examination and other activities were similar (22% in the case of the Japanese, 24% in the case of German professors). The striking difference thus is to be found in the amounts of teaching respectively research both actual and desirable between the Japanese and the German respondents who as a whole give teaching more weight than their Japanese colleagues. As for the number of students in lectures and seminars, it is understandable that this figure in Germany where there is no regulation of access in most courses of study would be higher than in Japan. Thus, in Japan 44% of respondent's lectures (for seminars even 95%) were attended by up to 50 students. In Germany the respective figures are different: There, true, 75% of respondents had up to 50 students in their seminars, but situation is worse in respect to lectures: there only 29% of respondents had up to 50 students, 45% even estimated to have regularly more than 100 students, 14,4% of the German respondents mentioned even more than 300 students, in the case of the Japanese professors only 1% mentioned this figure.

It was remarkable that a clear majority of 80 of respondents saw a deterioration of ***financing*** of the higher education sector. Nevertheless, only one third experienced a deterioration of material conditions in the own workplace. The latter figure (33,6%) is nearly exactly the same in the German survey (33,5%). Although the correspondent questions were not exactly the same (the Japanese questionnaire was more detailed in this case) it seems to be quite clear that the professors try to avert negative influence of retrenchment or other negative factors affecting their work away from teaching in both countries: Asked about changes in their productivity during the last five years, one third of the German respondents saw a decline of their productivity in respect of research but only 12,5% in teaching. Similarly, over 40% of the Japanese respondents quoted a strong or very strong negative influence on their research productivity (both in quantitative and qualitative terms), but only some 20% quoted such an effect in respect to their teaching. This could be interpreted in a way that in both cases the professors take (or have to take since control is stronger) their teaching obligations the most serious compared with other activities.

Nearly half of all respondents saw no change in their general work ***satisfaction*** during the past 5 years, 24,5% are more, 26,4% are less satisfied than 5 years ago. This is somewhat different from the respondents in Germany: there 40% claimed to be dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their general work conditions. Another difference seems to be satisfaction with the salary: Only 23,6% of the Japanese respondents were content (not one was very content) with their salary, but as much as 66,7% of the German respondents were content or even very content (10,1%) with their salary. It seems also to be noteworthy that communication with students is seen in a majority of answers positively: over 70% of the Japanese respondents were content in this respect, the corresponding figure for the German professors is 84,1%.

Finally, the last section, which referred to some discussed, expected or already initiated ***reform measures*** the university system is likely to undergo in order to cope with changed context conditions, the professors seem to be somewhat less conservative than one might expect. Many respondents rated positively certain measures, like offering better student life conditions, more emphasis to be put on quality of teaching, the establishment of unique profiles at the own university, an increased advertising, etc. Also, most remarkably, a clear majority of 58% of the respondents consented with the suggestion that a regular evaluation of the teaching and research quality of institutions (and thus also of themselves) should be introduced, provided that such an evaluation should be based on state-of-the-art-criteria, which would be as much objective as possible. Also in this case among German professors a majority of 58,5% responded positively to the suggestion that such a quality-evaluation should be undertaken and the corresponding figures be made public.

Summarizing, the outcome of the survey – which, it must be remembered once again, has a pilot character and is not representative in a strict sense, but which particularly in the light of comparison gains additional weight – one might say that the questions touched here seem to be relevant also in a more general context since many of the changes, which form the background of the conditions of academic work places and the profile, teaching and research functions of higher education institutions seem to be dependent on global factors of change. These factors, whatever they may be in detail, have created a climate and an ideology of "de-nationalization" and "marketizing" the educational system. In Japan where there is traditionally a very large market sector in the field of education this "de-nationalization" is just pushed forward – though some experts are suspicious that there is a strategy behind this, namely to restructure the higher education in order to differentiate also formally (and, among others, with consequences for the financing of higher education) the factual existing hierarchy. Though functionally highly differentiated, the present Japanese system does embrace all institutions benevolently under the designation of "universities". In Germany the tendency is the same although the situation is very different, because "marketizing" is just starting (although in the traditional system there had been elements of "market competition" since it was at times usual that the professors received a payment, which was linked to the number of students attending their classes). By and large the idea of a vertical differentiation of the university sector had been tabooed in the past. Recent attacks on this taboo like the evaluations of the Spiegel magazine[6] are strong hints at a changing situation. However, it seems clear that under the conditions of a mass higher education the traditional structure must change this way or the other. One problem might be seen in the fact that both in Japan and in Germany (and there to a still higher degree than in Japan) the contextual legal conditions of higher education institutions are not really giving them fair chances to act on the market since it is just this field, which is highly regulated be it in form of admission control (and many other respects) like in Japan, be it like in Germany where universities do not have any legal economical autonomy at all. "De-nationalization" and "marketizing" are fine, but seen in this light they might be just another strategy of retrenchment policy.

---

[6] see the poll among students and professors trying to establish a ranking, published in: Spiegel Spezial Nr. 1, 1990: "Welche Uni ist die beste?" and again in Spiegel Spezial Nr 3, 1993: "Welche Uni ist die beste? Spiegel Rangliste der deutschen Hochschulen.

IV. Appendix

Appendix a: Selected verbal comments of the respondents

- I think that the Japanese universities, especially the national universities, give too much consideration to the Education Ministry's intentions as far as accounting is concerned. The university's unique ideas about the appropriate way should be more respected.
- [to question 3.10.:] Nearly all (many) academic teachers at my university are not interested in additional funds from outside university because with the regular research money they receive from the university they can get along somehow. [to question 3.12.:] The way how the general staff is supporting the teachers is also an extremely important question. As far as retrenchment measures are concerned: since to the utmost a part of the expenses remained on the level of the previous year, I denied this question.
- International comparison is likely to be of great importance. As I see it, Japan´s present higher education system, although originating in the European system, aims at the multiplicity and differentiation of the North American system. In America there is much social mobility therefor the use of differentiation is very advantageous. In Japan, there is little mobility, no, the system is even extremely rigid. Thus the outcome of differentiation will perhaps not be very propitious.
- I am personally interested in the evaluation of universities, but in the spiritual climate of the academic world (and it is the same in politics) whatever you do, the outcome is the same. Probably, though it could be somewhat stimulating, one would become accustomed to whatever kind of evaluation, and it could end up to be treated with an easygoingness similar to that how students write a seminar paper. Nevertheless, I know many people who reflect very seriously the present conditions and the possibilities how to reform them. Apparently, since we profess to be a "self governing institution" we want to change the university based on our own potency, not by reacting on pressure from outside.
- It is usually claimed that to enter a Japanese university is difficult but to graduate is simple. In my department the share of those students who are able to graduate:
  after 4 years is about 60%,
  after 5 years is 25%,
  after 6 years is 10%.
  But objectively seen, all in all only 50% seem to have the scholarship to graduate. Therefore, we reflect upon alternatives like expulsion from school with the possibility to switch to another university etc. I also think time has come to reflect upon how to handle students who have only job-finding in their minds (are only interested in graduating). It is questionable if it is necessary, as it is practised presently, to bring practically all who had entered a university to graduation.
- The reform of the minds of academic teachers is necessary, but they are conservative and there are some who dream of being the academic staff of the old universities

when altogether many enrolled were élite students. We should reflect our didactic and we should think out device and measures how to awaken the interest in the students.

- Our Tsukuba University has, different from other universities, [and instead of "department" and "chair" etc.] a system of so called "gakkei", "gakugun" and "gakurui". That is to say that the teaching units and the research units are separate. As far as the research units are concerned, all academic staff from the same field of specializations is grouped together (education, psychology etc.), as far as the Conference of "gakkei"- ["root science groups"] and all respective members of the academic staff take part in the decisions over open questions. The "gakkei" is also entrusted with the guidance and teaching functions in the graduate schools. On the other hand as far as the teaching unit is concerned, there the different academic subjects (they can link together and form "gakugun") have a Conference of the academic subjects. There especially the education and teaching related matters are discussed and decided.
- Conditions in national universities and private universities are quite different...Especially since the difference between the salary at national universities and the salary at private universities is striking, I am uncontent. Although I have a level which is guaranteed, when I deduct presently from my salary the costs for living and others, then very little is left over and I cannot even buy books. Also I am dissatisfied because not all [members of the faculty] receive PCs and other equipment. I think if the present situation will continue, then extraordinarily talented people will instead of becoming researchers seek other ways for their career.
- It is surprising but often the case that the academic staff of the large universities in Japan, especially in the literature and language departments have no interest in the quantitative, actual conditions of their related departments or faculties and many people do not pay any attention to the mechanisms of decision over the faculty's budget and the tendencies of the next years changes.

Appendix b: English version of the questionnaire

I. Questions on your personal situation

I / 1. Please specify:

① year of birth — 19....

② sex
1. male
2. female

③ your present position
1. professor
2. assistant professor
3. lecturer

④ your present institution

junior college
a. national
b. prefectural
c. communal
d. private

4-year university without graduate school
a. national
b. prefectural
c. communal
d. private

4-year university with graduate school
a. national
b. prefectural
c. communal
d. private

I / 2. ① Does your university use the "chair-system"?

1. yes →②
2. no I / 3

if yes, is the chair you are attached to an "experimental chair"?

1. yes
2. no

I / 3 If the Japanese university system would be grouped into 5 levels both in respect to research quality and teaching quality, to which of the following level does your university belong to in your opinion?

a) quality of research

1.superior 2. above average 3. average 4. below average 5. inferior

b) quality of education

1.superior 2. above average 3. average 4. below average 5. inferior

---

I / 4 How does your university´s position in the ranking you gave in question I/3 influence your teaching and research conditions?

1. very positive influence
2. rather positively influence
3. no influence
4. rather negative influence
5. very negative influence

I / 5. Including the university you graduated from and including the university you presently teach at: to how many universities have you been affiliated to?

[examples...]

sum:..... universities

among them as a member of the teaching staff (lecturer, assistant professor, full professor) at sum..... universities

---

I / 6 Have you been or are you teaching externally as a part-time lecturer in another university?

1. yes, in sum.....universities
2. no

I / 7 Are you or have you been until now a member of an academic organization and if yes, in how many?

1. yes, in sum .....organizations → ②
2. no

② In how many of those organizations do you or did you hold an administrative or managerial position?

in ..... organizations

==========

II. Questions on your personal work conditions (academic year 1990-91)

II / 1 How many weekly course hours (1 course hour = 45 min) did you have to teach in the average of the whole academic year?

altogether .....hours

from these: on the undergraduate level
- lectures .....hours
- seminars .....hours
- other (laboratory etc.) .....hours

on the graduate level
(master and doctor course) .....hours

II / 2 Approximately how many students in average attended your classes during the last academic year

in lectures	in seminars	in other
1. less than 30	1. less than 30	1. less than 30
2. 30 - 49	2. 30 - 49	2. 30 - 49
3. 50 -99	3. 50 - 99	3. 50 - 99
4. 100 - 199	4. 100 - 199	4. 100 - 199
5. 200 -299	5. 200 - 299	5. 200 - 299
6. over 300	6. over 300	6. over 300

II / 3 If you sum up the whole time you spent for the activities listed below as 100 % during the past academic year, then approximately how was the actual distribution, and which distribution would you regard as optimal or wishful?

a) actual distribution	% of time	b) optimal (wished) distribution	% of time
- teaching	...%	- teaching	...%
- research	...%-	- research	...%
- examinations	...%	- examinations	...%
- administration	...%	- administration	...%
- other ( )	...%	- other (	)...%
- other ( )	...%	- other (	)...%
.....		.....	
total	100%	total	100%

II / 4 How many hours do you think was your weekly working time in the average of the last academic year?

sum.....hours per week

==========

III. The changing conditions of research and teaching in your university.

III / 1 Please specify the organizational units you are affiliated to in their hierarchical order and with the designations typical for your university

"gakubu", "gakkei" (faculty) etc.	.....
"gakka", "daikoza"," gakkashitsu"	.....
"koza", "kenkyushitsu"	.....
"senko"	.....
other	.....

III / 2 Which of the organizational units you named in question II / 1 is the most important for the planning, decision-making and realization of:

your research .....
your teaching .....
your material work conditions .....

III / 3 Comparing the number of students of your and the other faculties in your university, is your faculty (gakubu):

1. relatively large 2. medium size 3. relatively small
4. I am at a Junior College and this question cannot be answered.

III / 4 When it comes to decisions over: a) allotting the budget, b) making of the syllabus, has the department´s size (in terms of students) any influence on its (power) position?

a) Concerning the allocation of the budget:

① in my university are all faculties involved with equal competence

1. yes → b)
2. no → ②

② the allotting is done corresponding the number of the students

1. yes → b)
3. no →③

③ following which criteria is the budget distributed? Please specify: ⇨.....

b) Concerning decisions over the syllabus

① all faculties have the same power and competencies

1. yes → III / 5
2. no ....→ ②

② larger faculties are more powerful than smaller ones

1. yes → III / 5
3. no →③

③ which conditions influence the power concerning decisions over the syllabus? Please specify: ⇨.....

III / 5 ① Do you agree with the statement that in your university the allocation of the budget between the single departments and other units is based on criteria of objective needs?

1. yes → III / 6
2. no → ②

② According to which other criteria is the budget allocated? Please specify ⇨ .....

III / 6 Have the numbers of a) students, b) professors changed in your department over the past 5 years?

a) changes in student numbers
1. increased (about....students/.....%)
2. decreased (about....students/.....%)
3. no change

b) changes in the professor numbers
1. increased (about....persons/.....%)
2. decreased (about....persons/.....%)
3. no change

III / 7 ① Do you think that the present financial conditions of the higher education sector in general are worse than a decade ago?

1. yes → ②
2. no → III / 8

② do you think that this is the result of retrenchment policy towards the higher educational sector from the side of the government?

1. yes → III/8
2. no → ③

③ what other reasons do you see? Please specify:
⇨.....

III / 8 Have the material conditions of your work (research money, equipment, space, conditions of buildings etc.) changed during the past 5 years?

1. improved very much
2. improved somewhat
3. no change
4. somewhat deteriorated
5. very much deteriorated

III / 9 ① Have you - individually or as a member of a project group - received some research funds from sources outside your university? (②, ③, ④ multiple answers possible)

1. yes ➔ ②, ③, ④
2. no ➔ III/10

② Did you receive funds from private and/or public sources?

1. private sources
2. public sources

③ Did you receive funds individually and/or as a member of a research team?

1. individually
2. as a member of a team

④ When you compare the funds you received from the above sources with the regular research fund you receive from your university, how large are they approximately?

1. less than 5%
2. 6% - 10 %
3. between 10% and 20%
4. between 20% and 50%
5. more than 50%

III / 10 Which from the following external financial sources is the most important for your and your faculty - gakubu? (multiple answers possible)

1. central (national) state agencies
2. regional and local public agencies
3. other public agencies
4. private industry
5. other private agencies
6. partner university (city etc.)
7. international agencies

III / 11 Was your department during the past 5 to 10 years exposed to any retrenchment measures coming from inside or outside the university?

yes → following question
no → III / 12

How did these measures affect the quality of the following of your activities? (level of influence: 0: no influence to 4: very strong influence)

activity	level of influence				
a) student guidance/ counselling	0	1	2	3	4
b) amount of research	0	1	2	3	4
c) quality of research	0	1	2	3	4
d) number of publications	0	1	2	3	4
e) quantity of teaching	0	1	2	3	4
f) quality of teaching	0	1	2	3	4
g) other (please specify)	0	1	2	3	4

III / 12 Please encircle the corresponding grade of satisfaction with the following aspects of your work

	level of satisfaction			
a) time for teaching	+2	+1	-1	-2
b) time for administration	+2	+1	-1	-2
c) salary	+2	+1	-1	-2
d) general work conditions	+2	+1	-1	-2
e1) material work conditions (space)	+2	+1	-1	-2
e2) material work conditions (equipment)	+2	+1	-1	-2
f) communication with colleagues	+2	+1	-1	-2
g) communication with students	+2	+1	-1	-2
h) student's knowledge and study interest	+2	+1	-1	-2
i) recognition of your profession in society	+2	+1	-1	-2
j) recognition of your university in society	+2	+1	-1	-2
k) recognition of your faculty inside your university	+2	+1	-1	-2

III / 13 Seen over the period of the past 5 to 10 years, did the level of your general work satisfaction (the sum of the aspects questioned in III / 12) change?

+2 increased strongly
+1 increased somewhat
0 no change
-1 decreased somewhat
-2 decreased strongly

III / 14 ① Do you feel that over the past 5 to 10 years the climate of co-operation and work dedication deteriorated in your university?

1. yes → ②
2. no → IV/1

② Do you think that this is a result of retrenchment policy?

1. yes → IV/1
2. no → ③

③ Do you see other reasons? Please specify:
⇨----------

==========

IV. Questions on the university's present and future role and conditions.

IV / 1 Please indicate to which extend you agree or disagree with each of the following statements a) to e)

a) In Japan the number of 18 years old will decrease from 1993 on. But massification of higher education (growing number of freshmen) will continue:

+2 completely agree
+1 agree
-1 disagree
-2 completely disagree

b) In future there will be among students an even keener competition for admission to highly reputed universities:

+2 completely agree
+1 agree
-1 disagree
-2 completely disagree

(to be continued on the next page)

c) Because the 18 years old population-group is shrinking, there will be a keener competition among universities in order to secure enrolment figures:

+2 completely agree
+1 agree
-1 disagree
-2 completely disagree

d) Quantitative changes of the 19 years old population group will not affect my university.

+2 completely agree
+1 agree
-1 disagree
-2 completely disagree
+2 completely agree

e) retrenchment policy and cutting the research and education budgets is no problem for my university:

+2 completely agree
+1 agree
-1 disagree
-2 completely disagree
+2 completely agree

IV / 2 The decreasing number of the 18 years old together with retrenchment policy will cause quite certainly financial problems to the Japanese University. In order to cope with those problems, eventually your university plans or already decided upon taking measures quoted in the following list; Please indicate if and to which degree you would (you do) consent with each measure

content of plan/measures	measure planed or taken yes no	level of agreement
a) more advertising (in mass media	1. 2.	+2 +1 -1 -2
b) raising the tuition fee	1. 2.	+2 +1 -1 -2
c) using university facilities for commercial purpose	1. 2.	+2 +1 -1 -2
d) reducing the number of depart-ments	1. 2.	+2 +1 -1 -2
e) reducing the number of faculty members	1. 2.	+2 +1 -1 -2
f) reducing material costs	1. 2	+2 +1 -1 -2

(continued from page 11)

content of plan/measures	measure planed or taken yes	no	level of agreement			
g) to establish stronger ties with certain high schools	1.	2.	+2	+1	-1	-2
h) to increase reputation by adopting keener admission selection	1.	2.	+2	+1	-1	-2
i) to attract applicants by offering better students life conditions (counselling, facilities for extra-curricular activities etc.)	1.	2.	+2	+1	-1	-2
j) to establish a unique profile by introducing courses not offered at other universities	1.	2.	+2	+1	-1	-2
k) no organizational changes but increase of academic reputation by putting more stress on the quality of research	1.	2.	+2	+1	-1	-2
l) to increase of academic reputation by setting up new facilities like post-graduate studies, research institutes etc.	1.	2.	+2	+1	-1	-2
m) to increase reputation by putting more stress on the quality of teaching	1.	2.	+2	+1	-1	-2
n) try to attract more external research grants and project subsidies	1.	2.	+2	+1	-1	-2

IV / 3. Confronted with the following statement "In a highly diversified system, as is the case with the Japanese higher education system, the quality of research and of teaching of each single institution should be precisely and objectively evaluated using appropriate methods."

① Do you agree?

1. I agree → ③ will be the last question
2. I don't agree → ② will be the last question

② Why you do not agree? Please specify:
⇨----------

③ Are some of the following statements the reason for your greement and to what degree?

a) If the status of a university was based on objective criteria, the "examination hell" would loose ground.

0. I don`t think so
1. I agree partly
2. I agree completely

b) By using an objective evaluation of research and teaching, the respective special profile of any given university would become clearly discernible

0. I don`t think so
1. I agree partly
2. I agree completely

c) Taking the universities special profile into consideration, the higher education budget could be allocated more rationally

0. I don`t think so
1. I agree partly
2. I agree completely

d) Regular evaluation would stimulate the endeavour to higher quality of research and teaching

0. I don`t think so
1. I agree partly
2. I agree completely

e) other reasons. Please specify ⇨.....

Thank you for your co-operation.

Please use the following space if you would like to make any comments.

Appendix c:

Original version of the questionnaire in Japanese

大学の研究・教育条件に関する調査

（アンケート調査のお願い）

私は現在、日本学術振興会の外国人招へい研究者として、京都大学教育学部において日本の大学制度について研究しております。このたび研究の一環として、表記のようなアンケート調査を実施することを計画いたしました。調査結果は、並行して進めている国際比較調査（ドイツ、フランス、カナダ）と比較しながら、分析する予定でおります。ご多忙とは存じますが、この調査にご協力いただきたくお願い申し上げます。

平成３年１１月

ボトー・フォン・コップ　(Botho von KOPP)
(Deutsches Institut für Internationale
Pädagogische Forschung
Frankfurt am Main, Germany;
現在、京都大学教育学部招へい外国人学者)

ご回答いただいた内容はすべて統計処理をいたしますので、皆様にご迷惑をかけることは絶対にございません。

なおこの研究は、受け入れ研究者の京都大学教育学部江原武一助教授と協同で実施しておりますので、ご回答は下記あてにご返送下さい。またご不明の点も、下記の研究室までお問い合わせ下さるようお願い申し上げます。

〒６０６　京都市左京区吉田本町
京都大学教育学部比較教育学研究室
（江原武一）
電話：（０７５）－７５３－３０３９

Ⅰ．あなたご自身のことについて

Ⅰ／1．次の項目におこたえください。

①あなたの生年は　　（西暦）１９＿＿＿年

②あなたの性別は
1. 男性
2. 女性

③あなたの現在の地位は
1. 教授
2. 助教授
3. 講師

④あなたの現在の勤務先は
（a ～ lのうちあてはまる記号を○でかこんでください。）

短期大学
a. 国立
b. 都道府県立
c. 市立
d. 私立

大学院をもたない４年制大学
e. 国立
f. 都道府県立
g. 市立
h. 私立

大学院をもつ４年制大学
i. 国立
j. 都道府県立
k. 市立
l. 私立

Ⅰ／2．①あなたの大学は、講座制をとっていますか。

1. はい　→②へ
2. いいえ　→Ⅰ／3へ

②あなたの所属する講座は実験講座ですか。

1. はい
2. いいえ

I／3．日本の大学を　a)研究水準と　b)教育水準について、次の５つの層に分けるとしたら、あなたの大学はどのグループに属すると思いますか。<u>あなたの個人的見解でおこたえください</u>。

a)　研究水準について

1．上　　2．中の上　　3．中　　4．中の下　　5．下

b)　教育水準について

1．上　　2．中の上　　3．中　　4．中の下　　5．下

I／4．上のI／3でおこたえいただいたあなたの大学のランクは、あなた自身の研究・教育条件にどのように影響を及ぼしていると思いますか。

1．とてもプラスに作用している
2．ややプラスに作用している
3．影響はない
4．ややマイナスに作用している
5．とてもマイナスに作用している

I／5．あなたの現在の大学を含めて、これまでに研究したり勤務した大学の数はいくつですか。（例）にならっておこたえください。

（例）　東村山大学卒業
　　同　大学大学院修士課程修了　］　ひとつに数えます
　　所沢大学大学院博士後期課程退学
　　同　大学助手　］　ひとつに数えます
　　西武大学講師
　　同　大学助教授　］　ひとつに数えます
　　東武大学教授（現在）　―　合計４大学

合計＿＿＿＿大学

そのうち教授会の構成員（講師、助教授、教授）として　合計＿＿＿＿大学

I／6．あなたはこれまでに非常勤講師を引き受けたことがありますか。

1．ある　　合計＿＿＿＿大学
2．ない

Ⅰ／７．①あなたはこれまで、学会等の学術団体に所属したことがありますか。その数はいくつですか。

1. 所属したことがある
合計＿＿＿団体　→②へ

2. 所属したことはない　→Ⅱへ

②また、それらの団体において、あなたがこれまで会長や理事などの役員をつとめたことがあるものはいくつですか。

合計＿＿＿団体

Ⅱ．あなたの昨年度（１９９０年４月～１９９１年３月）の勤務条件について

Ⅱ／１．あなたは、あなたの大学で、平均して週に何時限授業を担当しましたか。４５分を１時限としておこたえください。

全体で　週＿＿＿時限

その内訳は
- 学部レベル
  - 講義　週＿＿＿時限
  - 演習（ゼミ）　週＿＿＿時限
  - その他（実験など）　週＿＿＿時限
- 大学院レベル　週＿＿＿時限

Ⅱ／２．昨年度を通じての平均で、あなたの授業には、一授業あたりおよそ何人の学生が出席していましたか。それぞれについてあてはまるものを○でかこんでください。

講義	演習	その他
1. ３０人未満	1. ３０人未満	1. ３０人未満
2. ３０～４９人	2. ３０～４９人	2. ３０～４９人
3. ５０～９９人	3. ５０～９９人	3. ５０～９９人
4. １００～１９９人	4. １００～１９９人	4. １００～１９９人
5. ２００～２９９人	5. ２００～２９９人	5. ２００～２９９人
6. ３００人以上	6. ３００人以上	6. ３００人以上

Ⅱ／３．次の業務に費やした時間の合計を１００％とした時、あなたは昨年度それぞれにどのような時間の振り分けかたをしたと思いますか。また、あなたにとって望ましい配分はどのようになるとお考えでしょうか。それぞれについて、おこたえください。

a) 昨年度の実際について

授業	＿＿＿％
研究	＿＿＿％
試験（定期試験、入試を含む）	＿＿＿％
大学の管理・運営（教授会など）	＿＿＿％
その他 （ ）	＿＿＿％
（ ）	＿＿＿％
（ ）	＿＿＿％
（ ）	＿＿＿％
合計	１００％

b) 望ましい配分について

授業	＿＿＿％
研究	＿＿＿％
試験	＿＿＿％
大学の管理・運営	＿＿＿％
その他 （ ）	＿＿＿％
（ ）	＿＿＿％
（ ）	＿＿＿％
（ ）	＿＿＿％
合計	１００％

Ⅱ／４．あなたの昨年度の一週間の平均労働時間は、何時間でしたか。法定の基準ではなく、あなたの「感じ」でおこたえください。

週に＿＿＿＿＿時間

Ⅲ．あなたの大学における研究・教育条件の変化について

Ⅲ／１．あなたの大学における所属組織について、それぞれの段階ごとにその名称をおこたえください。

	（例）	
学部または学系	文学部	＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿
学科、大講座、学科室	歴史学科	＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿
講座、研究室	日本史研究室	＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿
専攻		＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿
その他		＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

Ⅲ／2．先にⅢ／1でおこたえいただいた組織単位のうち、次の三つのことがらに関する計画、決定、実行の際に、もっとも重要な単位はどれですか。

あなたの研究 ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

あなたの授業 ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

物的諸条件 ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

Ⅲ／3．あなたの学部・学系の規模（在籍学生数）は、あなたの大学の他の学部・学系と比べて、

1．比較的大きい　2．中間　3．比較的小さい　4．単科大学なので該当しない

Ⅲ／4．あなたの大学において a) 予算の配分 や b)カリキュラムの構造や内容について決定する際に、学部の規模（在籍学生数）はどのように影響しますか。

a) 予算の配分について

①あなたの学部の権限は他の学部と同等ですか。

1．はい →b)へ
2．いいえ →②へ

②あなたの学部の権限は、学部の規模によって決定されますか。

1．はい →b)へ
2．いいえ →③へ

③どのような条件によって決定されますか。下にお書きください。

⇨ ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

b) カリキュラムの構造や内容について

①あなたの学部の権限は他の学部と同等ですか。

1．はい →Ⅲ／5へ
2．いいえ →②へ

②あなたの学部の権限は、学部の規模によって決定されますか。

1．はい →Ⅲ／5へ
2．いいえ →③へ

③どのような条件によって決定されますか。下にお書きください。

⇨ ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

Ⅲ／5．①あなたの大学の予算の配分は、それぞれの学部・学科・研究室などの客観的なニーズにもとづいて行われていると思いますか。

1. はい　→Ⅲ／6へ
2. いいえ　→②へ

②どのような基準にもとづいていると思いますか。下にお書きください。

⇒

Ⅲ／6．過去5年間に、あなたの学部の　a)　在籍学生数、b)　教授会の構成員数　は変化しましたか。

a)　在籍学生数

1. 増加した　（約＿＿＿人＿＿＿%）
2. 減少した　（約＿＿＿人＿＿＿%）
3. 変化していない

b)　教授会の構成員数

1. 増加した　（約＿＿＿人＿＿＿%）
2. 減少した　（約＿＿＿人＿＿＿%）
3. 変化していない

Ⅲ／7．①全体として、日本の高等教育の財政状況は、10年前よりも悪化していると思いますか。

1. はい　→②へ
2. いいえ　→Ⅲ／8へ

②それは、高等教育に対する政府の緊縮財政措置の結果だと思いますか。

1. はい　→Ⅲ／8へ
2. いいえ　→③へ

③何が原因だと思いますか。下にお書きください。

⇒

Ⅲ／８．過去５年間に、あなたの勤務にかかわる物的諸条件（校費、設備、スペース、建物など）は変化しましたか。

1. とても改善された
2. やや改善された
3. 変化していない
4. やや悪化した
5. ひどく悪化した

Ⅲ／９．①過去２年度を通じて、あなた若しくはあなたが参加している共同研究グループは学外からの研究助成金の交付を受けましたか。

1. はい　→②、③、④へ
2. いいえ　→Ⅲ／１０へ

②その研究助成金は民間部門と公的部門のどちらから交付されましたか（複数回答可です）。

1. 民間部門から
2. 公的部門から

③あなたは、その研究助成金を、次のどちらの資格で交付されましたか（複数回答可です）。

1. 個人として
2. 共同研究の一員として

④研究助成金の総額（共同研究から支出されたものも含みます）は、あなたが使える通常の校費と比べてどれくらいの割合でしたか。

1. ５％未満
2. ６％以上１０％未満
3. １０％以上２０％未満
4. ２０％以上５０％未満
5. ５０％以上

Ⅲ／１０．次の研究助成金の交付機関のうちで、あなたとあなたの学部にとって最も重要なのはどれですか（複数回答可です）。

1. 政府機関
2. 地方自治体
3. その他の公的機関
4. 民間企業
5. その他の民間の機関
6. 姉妹国・都市などの機関
7. 国際機関

Ⅲ／１１．過去５年ないし１０年の間に、あなたの学部は、何らかの緊縮財政措置を大学や学外から受けましたか。

1. はい　→次の質問におこたえください。
2. いいえ　→Ⅲ／１２へ

あなたの所属する組織において、その措置の影響が、全くなかった場合を０、最も大きかった場合を４とすると、次のことがらについてどのくらい影響を受けたと思いますか。それぞれ該当する数字を○でかこんでください。

領域		影響なし——————————影響最大				
a	学生の指導	0	1	2	3	4
b	研究の量的側面	0	1	2	3	4
c	研究の質的側面	0	1	2	3	4
d	出版件数	0	1	2	3	4
e	授業数	0	1	2	3	4
f	授業の質的側面	0	1	2	3	4
g	その他（　　）	0	1	2	3	4
h	（　　）	0	1	2	3	4

Ⅲ／１２．次のリストに掲げたことがらについて、あなたはどのように感じていますか。それぞれ該当する数字を○でかこんでください。

		実に満足	やや満足	やや不満	実に不満
a	授業にさかれる時間	＋２	＋１	－１	－２
b	大学の管理・運営にさかれる時間	＋２	＋１	－１	－２
c	給与	＋２	＋１	－１	－２
d	一般の勤務条件	＋２	＋１	－１	－２
e1	物的勤務条件　（スペース）	＋２	＋１	－１	－２
e2	物的勤務条件　（施設一般）	＋２	＋１	－１	－２
f	同僚との交流	＋２	＋１	－１	－２
g	学生との交流	＋２	＋１	－１	－２
h	学生の知識や勉学意欲	＋２	＋１	－１	－２
i	あなたの職業への社会的評価	＋２	＋１	－１	－２
j	あなたの大学への社会的評価	＋２	＋１	－１	－２
k	大学内でのあなたの学部への評価	＋２	＋１	－１	－２

Ⅲ／１３．過去５年ないし１０年間を通じて、前問（Ⅲ／１２．）でおこたえいただいたあなたの満足度は、全体として変化しましたか。

＋２．　満足度がとても増えた
＋１．　満足度がやや増えた
　０．　変化していない
－１．　満足度がやや減った
－２．　満足度がひどく減った

Ⅲ／１４．①過去５年ないし１０年間を通じてあなたの大学では、研究に対する献身的な努力や協同の雰囲気が損なわれてきたと思いますか。

1.　はい　　→②へ
2.　いいえ　→Ⅳ／１へ

②それは、緊縮財政のためだと思いますか。

1.　はい　　→Ⅳ／１へ
2.　いいえ　→③へ

③他にどのような原因があると思いますか。下にお書きください。

⇨

Ⅳ．大学の現状と大学の将来の役割について

Ⅳ／１．次の　a)から　e)の意見について、あなたはどう思いますか。あてはまる数字を○でかこんでください。

a)　日本では１９９３年から１８歳人口が大幅に減少するけれども、大学の大衆化が進んで進学率は上昇するだろう。

＋２．全く同じ見解である
＋１．同じ見解である
－１．見解が違う
－２．見解が全く違う

b)　社会的評価の高い大学をめざす受験競争はこれからも続くだろう。

＋２．全く同じ見解である
＋１．同じ見解である
－１．見解が違う
－２．見解が全く違う

（次ページにつづく）

（Ⅳ／１のつづき）

c） １８歳人口の減少のために、在籍学生数を確保するための大学間の競争は一層激しくなるだろう。

＋２．全く同じ見解である
＋１．同じ見解である
－１．見解が違う
－２．見解が全く違う

d） 私の大学には１８歳人口の変動の影響はないだろう。

＋２．全く同じ見解である
＋１．同じ見解である
－１．見解が違う
－２．見解が全く違う

e） 緊縮財政政策や研究・教育資金の縮小は私の大学にとっては問題にならないだろう。

＋２．全く同じ見解である
＋１．同じ見解である
－１．見解が違う
－２．見解が全く違う

Ⅳ／２．１８歳人口の減少や緊縮財政政策のために、日本の大学は将来財政難になるだろうと予想されています。この大学の財政難を乗り切るために、あなたの大学では次のリストにあげることがらを計画したり、検討したりしていますか。また、仮にあなたの大学がそれぞれの方策を実施するとしたら、あなたは賛成しますか、反対しますか。

		計画・検討されている	あなたの大学で実施するのに賛成しますか、反対しますか			
		1. はい	2. いいえ	全く賛成	賛成	不賛成	全く反対
a	広報の充実（マスコミ等による）	1.	2.	＋２	＋１	－１	－２
b	授業料の引き上げ	1.	2.	＋２	＋１	－１	－２
c	大学施設の商業的利用	1.	2.	＋２	＋１	－１	－２
d	学部数の削減	1.	2.	＋２	＋１	－１	－２
e	教官ポストの削減	1.	2.	＋２	＋１	－１	－２
f	物的経費の削減	1.	2.	＋２	＋１	－１	－２

（次ページにつづく）

（Ⅳ／2のつづき）

		計画・検討されている	あなたの大学で実施するのに賛成しますか、反対しますか			
		1. はい／2. いいえ	全く賛成	賛成	不賛成	全く反対
g	特定の高等学校との提携を強化する	1. 2.	＋2	＋1	－1	－2
h	入学の基準を厳しくして社会的評価を高める	1. 2.	＋2	＋1	－1	－2
i	学生生活の諸条件（カウンセリングや課外活動施設）を改善して志願者を増やす	1. 2.	＋2	＋1	－1	－2
j	他の大学にはない学部・学科を新設して大学の特色を強くうちだす	1. 2.	＋2	＋1	－1	－2
k	学部・学科等の編成は現状のまま研究の質の高さを強くアピールして大学の評価を高める	1. 2.	＋2	＋1	－1	－2
l	研究所・大学院修士課程・博士課程等を設置して、大学の評価を高める	1. 2.	＋2	＋1	－1	－2
m	授業の質の高さを強くアピールして社会的評価を高める	1. 2.	＋2	＋1	－1	－2
n	外部からの研究助成や補助金を増やす	1. 2.	＋2	＋1	－1	－2

Ⅳ／３．「日本の大学のように高度に多様化したシステムのもとでは、各大学の研究や教育の質は、適切な方法によって、明確かつ客観的に測定されるべきだ」という意見があります。

①この意見について、あなたはどう思いますか。

1. その通りだと思う　→③が最後の質問になります
2. そうは思わない　→②が最後の質問になります

②それはなぜですか。下にお書きください。

⇨

---

③その理由として、次のａ）からｅ）について、あなたはどう思いますか。

a) 大学が客観的な基準で評価されれば、「入試地獄」の解消がはかれるから。

0. そうは思わない
1. 多少その通りだと思う
2. 全くその通りだと思う

b) 研究や教育の質を客観的に評価することによって、各大学の特色をはっきりさせることができるから。

0. そうは思わない
1. 多少その通りだと思う
2. 全くその通りだと思う

c) 大学の特色に応じて予算や人的資源を合理的・効率的に配分できるから。

0. そうは思わない
1. 多少その通りだと思う
2. 全くその通りだと思う

d) 各大学や学部の研究や教育の質を高める刺激になるから。

0. そうは思わない
1. 多少その通りだと思う
2. 全くその通りだと思う

e) その他にどのような理由が考えられますか。下にお書きください。

⇨

66

以上で全ての質問が終わりました。貴重なお時間をさいていただきまして、誠にありがとうございました。

最後に、この調査についてご意見やご感想がありましたらお聞かせください。